



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,441	02/19/2002	Yoshiyuki Batori	1232-4823	9185

27123 7590 04/15/2005
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

MASINICK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2125

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/079,441

Applicant(s)

BATORI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D Masinick

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 and 43-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 and 43-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Feb. 14, 2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2125

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 14-28 and 43-45 are pending in this case.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments have made moot the rejections under USC 112 and those rejections are removed. Art rejections stand as previously written.

The wording of the claims in the current invention combined with the specification and the arguments presented by applicant still do not convince the examiner that the subject matter set forth in the claims is not able to be done using the AutoCAD software using the methods set forth by Wilson as cited previously. The concepts and differences between 3D modeling and 2D drawings have not been adequately explained (if there is indeed a difference between previously known modeling systems and the current invention).

All art rejections stand as previously written.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 14-18, 21-25, 28, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "AutoCAD 2000 – 3D Modeling, a Visual Approach" by John Wilson.

Art Unit: 2125

3. Referring to claim 14, 21, 28-36, Wilson shows an information processing apparatus comprising: display control means for controlling the display of a 3D model and the virtual plane in the same virtual 3D space from a view point on a visual line which is different from the normal line of the virtual plane (Figure 6-17), the virtual plane on which attribution information including at least one of dimensions and dimensional tolerance on a 3D model is pasted being set by the attribution allocation plane setting means (Page 461); and changing means for changing direction of the visual line in response to selecting the displayed virtual plane on the virtual 3D space so that the normal line of the displayed virtual plane may coincide with the virtual line (Pages 476 and 477).

4. Referring to claims 15, 16, 22, and 23, Wilson shows attribution information allocation means for allocating said attribution information in the normal direction of a virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means. Examiner notes that this means “using a layer” and assigning attributes to a specific layer. This is well known in as an AutoCAD function.

5. Referring to claims 17 and 24, Wilson shows display method setting means for setting at least one of a display information set, a display magnification, a display center and a display direction (Figure 6.18), storage means for storing, on said virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means, said display method information set by said display method setting means (“Dimensions in model space” paragraph on the page following page 459).

6. Referring to claims 18 and 25, Wilson shows holding means for holding, together with said 3D model, said virtual plane set by said attribution allocation plane setting means and said display method information set by said display method setting means. Examiner notes that this means “using a layer” and assigning attributes to a specific layer. This is well known in as an

Art Unit: 2125

AutoCAD function. Examiner also notes that the language of this claim is confusing and may be misinterpreted.

7. Referring to claims 43-45, Wilson shows attribution allocation plane selecting means for selecting a position of a virtual plane ("viewport", page 478), the virtual plane being displayed with a 3D model in the same virtual 3D space; and pasting means for pasting attribution information including at least one of dimensions and dimensional tolerance of the 3D model on the virtual plane in response to designating input of attribution information (figure 6-18 and page 461).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 19, 20, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "AutoCAD 2000 – 3D Modeling, a Visual Approach" by John Wilson as shown above and further in view of "AutoCAD 2000: The complete reference" by David Cohn.

10. Referring to claims 19 and 26, Wilson does not specifically show attribution information size setting means for, based on said display magnification for said display method information set by said display method setting means, setting the size of said attribution information base.

11. Cohn shows attribution information size setting means for, based on said display magnification for said display method information set by said display method setting means,

Art Unit: 2125

setting the size of said attribution information base (Examiner notes that this is an inherent feature to any graphics program. When you zoom in, the features get bigger.).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the basic AutoCAD information as shown in Cohn in the 3D modeling of Wilson because the parts shown in Cohn are simply pieces of the software of Wilson that are of such basic skill level that they are not shown in the reference. Examiners notes that all pieces of the Cohn reference are also found in the Wilson reference because it is the very same software program.

13. Examiner also notes that all claim limitations of claim 19 are moot because the “display magnification” limitation of claim 17 may not be selected.

14. Referring to claim 20 and 27, Cohn shows a display coordinate axis setting means for setting the horizontal or perpendicular direction on a display; and display means for displaying said 3D model or said attribution information based on information set by said display coordinate axis setting means (Figure 19.1).

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2125

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D Masinick whose telephone number is (571) 272-3746. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MDM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. P. Picard', with a stylized flourish at the end.

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100